

Samuel Heins, Esq.
Bryan L. Crawford, Esq.
Daniel E. Gustafson, Esq.
HEINS, MILLS & OLSON, P.C.
3550 IDS Center
80 South Eighth Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 338-4605
Facsimile: (612) 338-4692

Marc H. Edelson, Esq.
HOFFMAN & EDELSON
45 West Court Street
Doylestown, PA 18901
Telephone: (215) 230-8043
Facsimile: (215) 230-8735

Kenneth A. Wexler, Esq.
Elizabeth Fegan Hartweg, Esq.
THE WEXLER FIRM
One North LaSalle Street, Suite 2000
Chicago, IL 60602
Telephone: (312) 346-2222
Facsimile: (312) 346-0022

Eugene A. Spector, Esq.
Jeffrey L. Kodroff, Esq.
John A. Macoretta, Esq.
SPECTOR, ROSEMAN & KODROFF, P.C.
1818 Market Street, Suite 2500
Philadelphia, PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 496-0300
Facsimile: (215) 496-6611

ON BEHALF OF DEFENDANTS

By /s/ Nicholas C. Theodorou
Nicholas C. Theodorou, Esq. (BBO# 496730)
Jessica Barnett, Esq. (BBO# 650535)
FOLEY HOAG, LLP
155 Seaport Boulevard
Boston, MA 02210

DATED: July 1, 2005

D. Scott Wise, Esq. (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Kimberley Harris, Esq. (admitted *pro hac vice*)
DAVIS POLK & WARDWELL
450 Lexington Avenue
New York, NY 10017
Attorneys for Defendant AstraZeneca Pharmaceuticals]

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I, Thomas M. Sobol, an attorney, caused a true and correct copy of the foregoing Status Report to be served on all counsel of record electronically on July 1, 2005, pursuant to Section D of Case Management Order No. 2.

/s/ Thomas M. Sobol

Thomas M. Sobol, Esq.
HAGENS BERMAN LLP
One Main Street, 4th Floor
Cambridge, MA 02142
Telephone: (617) 482-3700
Facsimile: (617) 482-3003

MDL 1456 STATUS CHART – GOVERNMENT ENTITY CASES

| GOVERNMENT ENTITY CASES | MDL DOCKET NUMBER | ORIGINAL JURISDICTION | STATUS |
|--|-------------------|-----------------------|--|
| Montana v. Abbott Labs., Inc. et al. | 02-CV-12084-PBS | Removed to D. Mont. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> November 24, 2004 – Watson Pharmaceuticals, Inc.’s Motion to Dismiss the State of Montana’s Second Amended Complaint <i>sub judice</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> December 8, 2004 – State of Montana’s Opposition to Motion to Dismiss the State of Montana’s Second Amended Complaint December 16, 2004 – Watson Pharmaceuticals, Inc.’s Reply Memorandum in Support of Motion to Dismiss the State of Montana’s Second Amended Complaint (leave to file granted December 21, 2004) June 16, 2005 – Motion referred to Magistrate Judge Marianne B. Bowler. |
| Nevada v. American Home Products, Inc. et al (“Nevada II”) | 02-CV-12086-PBS | Removed to D. Nev. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> November 24, 2004 – Watson Pharmaceuticals, Inc.’s Motion to Dismiss the State of Nevada’s Amended Complaint <i>sub judice</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> December 8, 2004 – State of Nevada’s Opposition to Motion to Dismiss the State of Nevada’s Second Amended Complaint December 16, 2004 – Watson Pharmaceuticals, Inc.’s Reply Memorandum in Support of Motion to Dismiss the State of Nevada’s Second Amended Complaint (leave to file granted December 21, 2004) June 16, 2005 – Motion referred to Magistrate Judge Marianne B. Bowler. |
| California <i>ex rel.</i> Ven-A-Care of the Florida Keys, Inc. v. Abbott Labs., Inc. et al. | 03-CV-11226-PBS | Removed to C.D. Cal. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No pending motions |
| County of Nassau v. Abbott Labs., Inc. et al. | n/a | E.D.N.Y. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No pending motions |
| County of Erie v. Abbott Labs., Inc. et al. | n/a | W.D.N.Y. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> April 18, 2005 – Notice of Related Action filed with the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> May 12, 2005 – Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation conditionally transferred this action pursuant to Conditional Transfer Order No. 21 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> June 8, 2005 – Plaintiff filed a Motion to Vacate the Portion of Conditional Transfer Order No. 21 that Relates to the County of Erie June 27, 2005 – Defendants’ opposition to Plaintiff’s |

| GOVERNMENT ENTITY CASES | MDL DOCKET NUMBER | ORIGINAL JURISDICTION | STATUS |
|---|-------------------|--|--|
| | | | Motion to Vacate the Portion of Conditional Transfer Order No. 21 that Relates to the County of Erie |
| Consolidated County Case: City of New York (S.D.N.Y.) County of Albany (N.D.N.Y.) County of Allegany (W.D.N.Y.) County of Broome (N.D.N.Y.) County of Cattaraugus (W.D.N.Y.) County of Cayuga (N.D.N.Y.) County of Chautauqua (W.D.N.Y.) County of Chenango (N.D.N.Y.) County of Fulton (N.D.N.Y.) County of Genesee (W.D.N.Y.) County of Greene (N.D.N.Y.) County of Herkimer (N.D.N.Y.) County of Jefferson (N.D.N.Y.) County of Madison (N.D.N.Y.) County of Monroe (W.D.N.Y.) County of Niagara (N.D.N.Y.) County of Oneida (N.D.N.Y.) County of Onondaga (N.D.N.Y.) County of Putnam (S.D.N.Y.) County of Rensselaer (N.D.N.Y.) County of Rockland (S.D.N.Y.) County of St. Lawrence (N.D.N.Y.) County of Saratoga (N.D.N.Y.) County of Steuben (W.D.N.Y.) County of Suffolk (E.D.N.Y.) County of Tompkins (N.D.N.Y.) County of Warren (N.D.N.Y.) County of Washington (N.D.N.Y.) County of Wayne (W.D.N.Y.) County of Westchester (S.D.N.Y.) County of Yates (W.D.N.Y.) | n/a | E.D.N.Y. N.D.N.Y. S.D.N.Y. W.D.N.Y. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> March 30, 2005 – County of Suffolk’s Motion to Renew Its Second Motion to Compel the Production of Discovery From the Schering-Plough Corporation <i>sub judice</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> April 6, 2005 – Schering Plough’s Opposition to County of Suffolk’s Motion to Renew Its Second Motion to Compel the Production of Discovery June 15, 2005 – Redacted Consolidated Complaint filed in the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts <ul style="list-style-type: none"> June 15, 2005 – Plaintiffs’ Motion for Leave to File Consolidated Complaint Under Seal June 23, 2005 – Motion for Leave to File Consolidated Complaint Under Seal Denied. Defendants seeking redactions ordered to file affidavits within ten days. June 22, 2005 – Corrected Consolidated Complaint filed in the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts |

MDL 1456 STATUS CHART – PRIVATE CLASS CASES

| PRIVATE CLASS CASES | MDL DOCKET NO. | ORIGINAL JURISDICTION | STATUS |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| Master Consolidated Class Action | Master File 01-CV-12257-PBS | D. Mass. pursuant to JPML Order | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May 3, 2004 – Plaintiffs’ Motion to Compel The Production of Documents Created During the Relevant Time Period from Defendants Abbott Laboratories, AstraZeneca, Schering Plough, Sicor and Together Rx Defendants <i>sub judice</i> (Magistrate Bowler) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ May 17, 2004 – Certain Defendants’ Notice of Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Motion to Compel the Production of Certain Documents and Consent Motion for an Extension of Time ○ May 26, 2004 – Notice of Withdrawal of Plaintiffs’ Motion to Compel the Production of Documents Created During the Relevant Time Period Directed at Defendant Schering–Plough (<i>Note: withdrawal applies only to Schering-Plough</i>) ○ May 27, 2004 – Consent Motion for an Extension of Time to Oppose the Motion to Compel ○ May 27, 2004 – Opposition of the Together Rx Defendants to Plaintiffs’ Motion to Compel the Production of Documents ○ May 28, 2004 – Notice Of Withdrawal Of Plaintiffs’ Motion To Compel The Production Of Documents Created During The Relevant Time Period Directed at Defendant Abbott Laboratories (<i>Note: withdrawal applies only to Abbott Laboratories</i>) ○ June 8, 2004 – Notice of Withdrawal of Plaintiffs’ Motion to Compel the Production of Documents Created During the Relevant Time Period Directed at Defendant AstraZeneca. (<i>Note: withdrawal applies only to AstraZeneca</i>) ○ June 9, 2004 – Plaintiffs’ Reply Memorandum In Support of Motion To Compel The Production of Documents Created During The Relevant Time Period From The Together Rx Defendants ○ June 22, 2004 – Order granting Plaintiffs’ Motion to Withdraw Motion to Compel Directed at Abbott Laboratories ○ June 22, 2004 – Order granting AstraZeneca’s Assented to Motion for Extension of Time to File Response to Plaintiffs’ Motion to Compel ○ June 22, 2004 – Order finding as Moot AstraZeneca’s Motion for Extension of Time to Oppose Plaintiffs’ Motion to Compel ○ Awaiting scheduling of hearing or ruling by Court as to Together Rx Defendants. |

| PRIVATE CLASS CASES | MDL DOCKET NO. | ORIGINAL JURISDICTION | STATUS |
|---|----------------|-----------------------|--|
| Master Consolidated Class Action (continued) | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • September 3, 2004 – Plaintiffs’ Motion for Class Certification <i>sub judice</i> (Judge Saris) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ October 25, 2004 – Track 1 Defendants’ Consolidated and Individual Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Motion for Class Certification, with supporting declarations and exhibits ○ December 17, 2004 – Plaintiffs’ Amended Motion for Class Certification ○ December 17, 2004 – Plaintiffs’ Reply Memoranda to Consolidated and Individual Oppositions to Plaintiffs’ Motion for Class Certification ○ January 21, 2005 – Track 1 Defendants’ Consolidated and Individual Surreplies to Plaintiffs’ Motion for Class Certification, with supporting declarations and exhibits ○ February 8, 2005 – Memorandum of the Attorney General of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in Opposition to Class Certification ○ February 10, 2005 – State of California’s and Relator’s Statement of Position Regarding Certification of Class ○ March 10, 2005 – Track 1 Defendants’ Comments on the Report of Dr. Ernst R. Berndt ○ March 10, 2005 – Plaintiffs’ Memorandum Regarding the Berndt Report ○ March 25, 2005 – Order of Judge Patti B. Saris striking Rebuttal Declaration of Raymond S. Hartman in Response to the Sur-Reply Declaration of Steven J. Young. • October 25, 2004 – Track 1 Defendants’ Motion to Strike the Declaration of Raymond S. Hartman <i>sub judice</i> (Judge Saris) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ December 17, 2004 – Plaintiffs’ Memorandum in Opposition to Motion to Strike the Declaration of Raymond S. Hartman ○ January 21, 2005 – Track 1 Defendants’ Reply in Support of Their Motion to Strike the Declaration of Raymond S. Hartman • December 17, 2004 – Plaintiffs’ Motion to Strike the Declaration of Eric M. Gaier, Ph.D <i>sub judice</i> (Judge Saris) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ January 21, 2005 – Track 1 Defendants’ Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Motion to Strike the Declaration of Eric M. Gaier, Ph.D ○ February 2, 2005 – Plaintiffs’ Reply in Support of Their Motion to Strike the Declaration of Eric M. Gaier, Ph.D |

| PRIVATE CLASS CASES | MDL DOCKET NO. | ORIGINAL JURISDICTION | STATUS |
|---|----------------|-----------------------|--|
| Master Consolidated Class Action (continued) | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • December 17, 2004 – Plaintiffs’ Motion to Strike the Declaration of Steven J. Young <i>sub judice</i> (Judge Saris) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ January 21, 2005 – Track 1 Defendants’ Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Motion to Strike the Declaration of Steven J. Young ○ February 4, 2005 – Plaintiffs’ Reply in Support of Their Motion to Strike the Declaration of Steven J. Young • December 17, 2004 – Plaintiffs’ Motion to Strike Portions of the Declaration of Robert P. Navarro <i>sub judice</i> (Judge Saris) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ January 21, 2005 – Track 1 Defendants’ Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Motion to Strike Portions of the Declaration of Robert P. Navarro ○ February 2, 2005 – Plaintiffs’ Reply in Support of Their Motion to Strike Portions of the Declaration of Robert P. Navarro • February 3, 2005 – Plaintiffs’ Motion to Compel and for Finding that AstraZeneca’s Pricing, Marketing, and Sales of its Products are not Protected by the Attorney-Client Privilege <i>sub judice</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ February 24, 2005 – AstraZeneca Pharmaceuticals LP’s Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Motion to Compel and for Finding that AstraZeneca’s Pricing, Marketing, and Sales of its Products are not Protected by the Attorney-Client Privilege, and Cross-Motion for a Protective Order Relating to the April 2, 2004 Amended Notice of Rule 30(b)(6) Deposition ○ March 20, 2005 – Reply in Support of Plaintiffs’ Motion to Compel and For Finding That Documents and Testimony Related to AstraZeneca’s Pricing, Marketing and Sales of Its Products Are Not Protected by the Attorney-Client Privilege and Opposition to AstraZeneca’s Cross-Motion for a Protective Order ○ May 31, 2005 – Affidavit of Stuart Fullerton in response to Court Order dated May 17, 2005 • February 23, 2005 – Third Party Schaller Anderson Inc.’s Objection and Motion to Quash Plaintiffs’ Subpoena • March 10, 2005 – Plaintiffs’ Motion to Strike Sur-Reply Declaration of Steven J. Young <i>sub judice</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ April 7, 2005 – Track 1 Defendants’ Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Motion to Strike Sur-Reply Declaration of Steven J. Young ○ April 27, 2005 – Order Granting Track 1 Defendants’ Motion to |

| PRIVATE CLASS CASES | MDL DOCKET NO. | ORIGINAL JURISDICTION | STATUS |
|---|----------------|-----------------------|---|
| Master Consolidated Class Action (continued) | | | <p>File under Seal memorandum of law in opposition to Plaintiff's Motion to Strike the Sur-Reply Declaration of Steven J. Young.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • March 14, 2005 – Plaintiffs' Motion for Sanctions Based on Defendants' Submittal of Sur-Reply Declaration of Steven J. Young <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Track 1 Defendants' Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion to Strike Sur-Reply Declaration of Steven J. Young ○ April 27, 2005 – Order Granting Track 1 Defendants' Motion to File under Seal memorandum of law in opposition to Plaintiff's Motion to Strike the Sur-Reply Declaration of Steven J. Young. ○ Plaintiffs have requested a hearing with the Court on this motion. • March 21, 2005 – B. Braun Medical Inc.'s Motion to Dismiss the Second Amended Master Consolidated Class Action Complaint <i>sub judice</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ April 4, 2005 – Class Plaintiffs' Opposition to B. Braun Medical Inc.'s Motion to Dismiss the Second Amended Master Consolidated Class Action Complaint ○ April 27, 2005 – B. Braun Medical Inc.'s Reply Memorandum in Support of Its Motion to Dismiss the Second Amended Master Consolidated Class Action Complaint ○ June 7, 2005 – Motion referred to Magistrate Judge Marianne B. Bowler ○ June 17, 2005 – Class Plaintiffs' Notice of Supplemental Authority in Support of Their Opposition to B. Braun Medical Inc.'s Motion to Dismiss the Second Amended Master Consolidated Class Action Complaint ○ June 28, 2005 – B. Braun Medical Inc.'s Response to Plaintiffs' Notice of Supplemental Authority in Support of Their Opposition to B. Braun Medical Inc.'s Motion to Dismiss the Second Amended Master Consolidated Class Action Complaint ○ Motion hearing scheduled for July 14, 2005 at 10:30AM • May 23, 2005 – B. Braun Medical Inc.'s Motion for a Protective Order Staying Discovery Pending Resolution of its Motion to Dismiss <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ June 6, 2005 – Plaintiffs' Opposition to B. Braun Medical Inc.'s Motion for a Protective Order Staying Discovery Pending Resolution of its Motion to Dismiss • June 10, 2005 – Plaintiffs' Motion to Compel Aventis to Produce Rule |

| PRIVATE CLASS CASES | MDL DOCKET NO. | ORIGINAL JURISDICTION | STATUS |
|--|-----------------|-----------------------|---|
| | | | <p>30(b)(6) Designees, and for Sanctions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ June 24, 2005 – Aventis Pharmaceuticals Inc.’s Response to Plaintiffs’ Motion to Compel Depositions and for Sactions ○ Motion hearing scheduled for July 14, 2005 at 10:30AM <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • June 14, 2005 – Defendant Sicor Inc. and Sicor Pharmaceuticals, Inc.’s motion for Protective Order with Memorandum in Support <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ June 28, 2005 – Plaintiffs’ Response to Sicor’s Motion for Protective Order • June 24, 2005 – Plaintiffs’ Motion to Compel Defendants Dey, Inc and Dey L.P. to Produce Documents in the Manner Required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 34(b) and to Produce its Optical Character Recognition for Electronic Documents |
| Congress of California Seniors v. Abbott Labs., Inc. et al. | 03-CV-10216-PBS | Removed to C.D. Cal. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consolidated into Master Class Action |
| International Union of Operating Engineers, Local No. 68 Welfare Fund v. AstraZeneca PLC et al. | 04-11503-PBS | Removed to D.N.J. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Motion to Remand filed in District of New Jersey prior to transfer; briefed while pending in District of New Jersey <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ April 22, 2005 – Supplemental Brief in Support of Motion for Remand by Plaintiff International Union of Operating Engineers Local No. 68 Welfare Fund ○ May 3, 2005 – Rejection of Supplemental Brief in Support of Motion for Remand by Plaintiff International Union of Operating Engineers Local No. 68 Welfare Fund ○ May 6, 2005 – Supplemental Brief in Opposition to Motion for Remand by Plaintiff International Union of Operating Engineers Local No. 68 Welfare Fund due to be filed ○ June 1, 2005 – Supplemental Brief in Support of Motion for Remand by Plaintiff International Union of Operating Engineers Local No. 68 Welfare Fund re-filed |